## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

STATE OF NEW MEXICO *ex rel*. State Engineer, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

69cv07941 BB Rio Chama Adjudication

RAMON ARAGON, et al.,

Defendants.

## **ORDER**

**THIS MATTER** comes before the Court on Mike Purdy's *pro se* Motion (Doc. No. 9794, filed June 2, 2010) regarding Subfile Nos. 255 and 257 (*See* Doc. No. 9636).

The content of Mr. Purdy's *pro se* motion now before the Court is identical<sup>1</sup> to that of several other *pro se* motions that the Court has previously construed as objections to the Special Master's Report on Priorities for Three Acequias (Doc. No. 9546, filed December 16, 2009). (*See* Mem. Op. and Order at 4, Doc. No. 9720, filed May 21, 2010). The Court has ruled that it would limit its consideration of objections to the Special Master's Report to those filed by persons that timely objected to the Notices and Orders to Show Cause or their successors-in-interest. (*See* Mem. Op. and Order at 3-4, Doc. No. 9700, filed April 28, 2010) (listing the parties, along with their respective subfile numbers, that filed timely objections to the Notices and Orders to Show Cause)).

The Court will **DENY** Mr. Purdy's Motion because there were no timely objections to the Notices and Orders to Show Cause for the relevant subfiles. (*See* Mem. Op. and Order at 4-5, Doc.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Motions are forms with the only differences being the names of the *pro se* parties and the docket numbers referencing their objections to the Special Master's Report.

No. 9720, filed May 21, 2010) (ruling on several other *pro se* motions which are identical to those now before the Court.).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

BRUCE D. BLACK

Brue D Black

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE